arXiv:1610.07509v2 [math.GT] 27 Oct 2016

MORSE CELLS

HENRY C. KING

1. Introduction

This paper is in the category *proof of something not deep or significant which I knew was true and told my students was true but for which I am not aware of a published reference*. In particular, when encountering theorem 3.5 in Milnor's "Morse Theory" which says a manifold has the homotopy type of a CW complex with a k cell for each index k critical point of a Morse function, I would remark that in fact as long as the gradientlike vector field is generic, the manifold is a CW complex and the cells are the (closures of) the stable manifolds. So to be honest I should write down a proof. Doing so led to investigating untico resolution towers, manifolds with nice corners on the boundary, and other amusing notions.

Since posting version 1 of this paper others have kindly pointed out previous work on some of these things. In particular the result above has appeared before, so I could have saved myself the trouble. Indeed it appears there is enough activity that I was wrong to consider the question insignificant as it appears to lead to much interesting work. I stand corrected. I'll leave this paper up though since I may end up using the work on resolution towers and stratifications elsewhere. There is a nice discussion in http://mathoverflow.net/questions/86610 particularly the post by Liviu Nicolaescu which indicates work by Lizhen Qin see [10] and [11], reference to [3], as well as his own [9]. There are a number of references to Laudenbach's appendix to [2] proving this result early on. The post http://mathoverflow.net/questions/11375 is also relevant. Many thanks to Patrick Massot for first alerting me to all this.

Manifolds with convex corners on the boundary were apparently developed in the early 1960s by Cerf although I presume there was earlier work, particularly at the elementary level used here, since they arise whenever one takes the product of manifolds with boundary. More recently [5] is easily available online and gives references to earlier work. Of course I should have included references to early work on Whitney stratifications, Thom stratifications (I guess these are often called Thom-Mather stratifications but I learned them from Mather), for example [12], [4], and [8]. I have a vague recollection that Thom was originally thinking of an approach to stratifications closer to the resolution towers given here, but later switched to the Thom data approach refined by Mather, but this may be erroneous. The resolution tower approach was mentioned at the end of [7] and one motivation for this paper was to expand on those remarks.

Date: October 28, 2016.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 57N50; Secondary: 57N37.
Key words and phrases. CW complex.

2. Manifolds with Convex Corners on the Boundary

Usually corners of a smooth manifold are swept under the rug, smoothed out as soon as possible when they appear and viewed as a minor nuisance, not to be thought of too much. However, while writing this paper, it became clear that it would be useful to use a certain type of corner on the boundary of a smooth manifold and indeed to embrace this extra structure.

A smooth manifold with convex corners on the boundary is a manifold with charts based on open subsets of $[0,\infty)^n$. The corners give a stratification of the manifold according to the depth of the corner, a depth k corner point in an n dimensional smooth manifold with convex corners on the boundary looks like 0 in $[0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. We let $\partial_k M$ denote the set of points of a manifold M with depth k and $\bar{\partial}_k M = Cl\partial_k M = \bigcup_{j\geq k} \partial_j M$.

Lemma 1. *The depth of a point in a manifold with convex corners on the boundary is well defined.*

Proof. For any point x in a manifold M with convex corners on the boundary, define the tangent cone at x to be the subset of the tangent space T_xM of M at x which are velocities at x of a curve in M. In other words, take a smooth curve $\alpha\colon ([0,\infty),0) \to (M,x)$, then $d\alpha(t)/dt|_{t=0}$ is in the tangent cone at x. Then note that $\dim M$ minus the depth of x is the maximum dimension of a linear subspace of T_xM which is contained in the tanget cone at x. □

If $N \subset M$ is a submanifold, we say that N has boundary compatible with M if at every point of N, the pair (M,N) is locally diffeomorphic to the pair $[0,\infty)^k \times (\mathbb{R}^{m-k}, \mathbb{R}^{n-k})$, where k is the depth of the point in both M and N.

If $h\colon M \to N$ is a smooth map between manifolds with convex corners on the boundary, we say that h is a strong submersion if it locally looks like projection of $[0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times [0,\infty)^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^{m-n-\ell}$ to $[0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $h\colon M \to N$ is a smooth map between manifolds with convex corners on the boundary. The following are equivalent.*

1. *h is a strong submersion*
2. *For any $x \in M$, suppose x has depth ℓ, $h(x)$ has depth k, and we choose local coordinates $g\colon (U,h(x)) \to ([0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}, 0)$ in a neighborhood U of $h(x)$. Then there are local coordinates*

$$f\colon (V,x) \to ([0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times [0,\infty)^{\ell-k} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-n-\ell+k}, 0)$$

in a neighborhood V of x so that ghf^{-1} is the restriction of projection

$$[0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times [0,\infty)^{\ell-k} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-n-\ell+k} \to [0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}.$$

Proof. We need to show that 1 implies 2. Since h is a strong submersion we know there are local coordinates $f'\colon (V',x) \to ([0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times [0,\infty)^{\ell-k} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-n-\ell+k}, 0)$ in a neighborhood V' of x and $g'\colon (U',h(x)) \to ([0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}, 0)$ in a neighborhood U' of $h(x)$ so that $g'hf'^{-1}(u,v,w,y) = (u,v)$. Define f by $ff'^{-1}(u,v,w,y) = (u',v',w,y)$ where $(u',v') = gg'^{-1}(u,v)$. Then

$$ghf^{-1}(u',v',w,y) = ghf'^{-1}(u,v,w,y) = gg'^{-1}(u,v) = (u',v').$$

□

Lemma 3. *The composition of two strong submersions is a strong submersion.*

Proof. Suppose $h\colon M \to N$ and $h'\colon N \to N'$ are strong submersions. Pick any $x \in M$ and any local coordinates $g'\colon (V', h'h(x)) \to ([0,\infty)^{k'} \times \mathbb{R}^{n'-k'}, 0)$. By Lemma 2 there are local coordinates

$$g\colon (V, h(x)) \to ([0,\infty)^{k'} \times \mathbb{R}^{n'-k'} \times [0,\infty)^{k-k'} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-n'-k+k'}, 0)$$

so that $g'h'g^{-1}$ is projection and there are local coordinates

$$f\colon (U, x) \to ([0,\infty)^{k'} \times \mathbb{R}^{n'-k'} \times [0,\infty)^{k-k'} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-n'-k+k'} \times [0,\infty)^{\ell-k} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-n-\ell+k}, 0)$$

so that ghf^{-1} is projection. Then $g'h'hf^{-1} = g'h'g^{-1}ghf^{-1}$ is projection. □

Lemma 4. *Suppose $h\colon M \to N$ is a smooth map between manifolds with convex corners on the boundary and h is a submersion, i.e., dh has rank $\dim N$ everywhere. Suppose h preserves depth, i.e., for each k, $h(\partial_k M) \subset \partial_k N$. Then h is a strong submersion.*

Proof. Pick any $x \in M$ with depth k. If $k = 0$ then h is trivially a strong submersion at x, so suppose $k > 0$. Choose any local coordinates $f\colon (U, x) \to ([0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{m-k}, 0)$ and $g\colon (V, h(x)) \to ([0,\infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}, 0)$. After restricting U we may as well assume that $f^{-1}(0 \times (0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-k})$ is connected, for example if $f(U)$ is convex. Then after reordering coordinates we may suppose that

$$ghf^{-1}(0 \times (0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-k}) \subset 0 \times (0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$$

since h preserves the depth 1 points. By induction on k we know that ghf^{-1} restricts to a strong submersion from $f(U) \cap 0 \times [0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-k}$ to $0 \times [0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. So we may choose local coordinates $f'\colon (U', 0) \to [0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-k}$ in a neighborhood of 0 in $0 \times [0,\infty)^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-k}$ so that $ghf^{-1}f'^{-1}(y_2, y_3, \ldots, y_m) = (0, y_2, \ldots, y_n)$. So after composing f with the map $y \mapsto (y_1, f'(y_2, \ldots, y_m))$ we may as well suppose that $ghf^{-1}(0, y_2, \ldots, y_m) = (0, y_2, \ldots, y_n)$.

Let $h_i(y)$ denote the i-th coordinate of $ghf^{-1}(y)$. Since dh has rank n at x we know $\partial h_1/\partial y_1(0) \neq 0$. Since h preserves depth we know that for each $i \leq k$, there is a $j_i \leq k$ so that for any y near 0 with $y_i = 0$ and $y_j \neq 0$ for $j \neq i$ then $h_{j_i}(y) = 0$. We know $j_1 = 1$. We also know $j_i = i$ for $i > 1$ since if we take y near 0 with $y_1 = y_i = 0$ and $y_j \neq 0$ for $j \neq 1, i$ then $h_j(y) = 0$ iff $j = 1$ or i but then since $\partial h_1/\partial y_1 \neq 0$ if we make y_1 small and nonzero, only $h_i(y) = 0$.

Consider the change of coordinates $z_i = h_i(y)$ for $i \leq n$ and $z_i = y_i$ for $i > n$. After incorporating this change of coordinates in f we see $ghf^{-1}(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ and thus h is a strong submersion. □

3. Stratified sets

For this paper, a stratified set X is a locally compact, second countable, Hausdorff, necessarily paracompact space which we denote $|X|$ and a decomposition of $|X| = \bigcup S$ into a locally finite union of disjoint subsets S called strata, each of which has the structure of a smooth manifold with convex corners on the boundary. I feel more comfortable if we specify that the dimensions of the strata be bounded, but perhaps this is not necessary. We assume each stratum is locally closed in $|X|$. If T and S are disjoint strata and $T \cap ClS$ is nonempty we ask that $T \subset ClS$ and $\bar{\partial}_k T = T \cap Cl\partial_k S$ for all k.

If $T \cap ClS$ is nonempty we say $T \preceq S$ and if in addition $T \neq S$ we say $T \prec S$.

The k skeleton of a stratified set X is the union of its strata of dimension $\leq k$. This is also a stratified set. The depth[1] of a point in $|X|$ is the depth of x in the stratum containing x. Note that the depth k points of X inherit the structure of a stratified set without boundary.

If N is a smooth manifold and $f\colon |X| \to N$ we say f is smooth if the restriction of f to each stratum of X is C^∞.

If U is an open subset of $|X|$ then U inherits the structure of a stratified set from X, the strata are $S \cap U$ for strata S of X which intersect U.

I fully expect that somewhere below I will inadvertently write X where I should write $|X|$ and apologize in advance for the imprecision.

Lemma 5. *If K is a compact subset of a stratified set there are only finitely many strata S so that $ClS \cap K$ is nonempty.*

Proof. By local finiteness, for each $x \in K$ there is an open neighborhood V_x of x which intersects only finitely many strata. The open cover $\{V_x\}$ of K has a finite subcover. □

Lemma 6. *If X is a stratified set, there is a sequence of compact subsets $K_i \subset |X|$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ so that $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty K_i = |X|$ and for each i, $K_i \subset \mathrm{Int} K_{i+1}$.*

Proof. This only requires second countability and local compactness. Let $\{L_i\}$ be a countable basis for the topology of $|X|$. By local compactness, every $x \in |X|$ is contained in some L_i whose closure is compact. Consequently by taking a subsequence, we have a countable collection of open sets $\{L_i'\}$ so that each L_i' has compact closure and $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty L_i' = |X|$. Suppose by induction we have a sequence of compact sets $K_1, \ldots, K_{k-1}$ so that for each $i < k-1$, $K_i \subset \mathrm{Int} K_{i+1}$ and so that for each $i < k$, $L_i' \subset K_i$. We must construct K_k. By compactness of K_{k-1} there is a finite collection of the L_i' which cover K_{k-1}, let K_k be the union of the closures of these L_i' as well as ClL_k'. □

4. Thom stratified sets

A stratified set X is a Thom stratified set if it is equipped with Thom data $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S)\}$. Thom data is for every stratum S an open neighborhood U_S of S in $|X|$, a smooth retraction $\pi_S\colon U_S \to S$ and a smooth distance function $\rho_S\colon U_S \to [0, \infty)$ so that:

- For every stratum S, $S = \rho_S^{-1}(0)$.
- If $T \prec S$ then $\pi_T = \pi_T \pi_S$ and $\rho_T = \rho_T \pi_S$ wherever both sides are defined.
- If $T \prec S$ then $\rho_T \times \pi_T | \colon U_T \cap S \to (0, \infty) \times T$ is a strong submersion.
- If $T \prec S$ and $x \in S \cap U_T$ the depth of x in S equals the depth of $\pi_T(x)$ in T.

Suppose we have a Thom stratified set and for every stratum S we choose an open neighborhood U_S' of S in U_S. Then we obtain another Thom stratified set by restricting each π_S and ρ_S to U_S'. We do this often and refer to it as shrinking the U_S. Of course we could avoid this by changing the definition so that π_S and ρ_S are germs at S, and this is usually done by other authors. I have chosen not to do so.

[1]There is also the notion of the depth of a stratified set, being the maximal difference in the dimensions of two strata of X. The only possible confusion I can think of is when X is a single point in which case both notions of depth are zero. In any case we won't use this other notion of depth in this paper.

We say that a smooth function $\delta_S\colon S \to (0,\infty)$ is a frontier limit function if the restriction of π_S to $\{x \in U_S \mid \rho_S(x) \leq \delta_S\pi_S(x)\}$ is proper, i.e., for any compact $K \subset S$, $\pi_S^{-1}(K) \cap \{x \in U_S \mid \rho_S(x) \leq \delta_S\pi_S(x)\}$ is compact. A frontier limit function may not exist, for example ρ_S might approach 0 as you approach the frontier of U_S. However, after shrinking U_S they are guaranteed to exist.

Lemma 7. *For any stratum S of a Thom stratified set, after shrinking U_S there is some frontier limit function.*

Proof. Probably the reader can come up with a nicer proof than the following, but here goes. For any $x \in S$, choose a compact neighborhood V_x of x in U_S. By paracompactness we may choose a locally finite refinement $\{O_\alpha\}$ of the cover $\{S \cap \mathrm{Int}V_x\}$ of S. For each α there is an $x_\alpha \in S$ so that $O_\alpha \subset V_{x_\alpha}$. Let $U'_S = \bigcup_\alpha \pi_S^{-1}(O_\alpha) \cap \mathrm{Int}V_{x_\alpha}$ and let $U''_S = U_S \cap ClU'_S$. We will shrink U_S to U'_S.

I claim that $\pi_S|\colon U''_S \to S$ is proper. Take any compact $K \subset S$, then by local finiteness K intersects only a finite number of O_α and hence $\pi_S^{-1}(K) \cap U''_S$ is covered by a finite number of the compact V_{x_α} and is hence compact.

For each $x \in S$ choose $\delta_x > 0$ less than the minimum of ρ_S on the compact set $(U''_S - U'_S) \cap \pi_S^{-1}(V_x)$. Take a smooth partition of unity $\{\phi_x\}$ for the open cover $\{S \cap \mathrm{Int}V_x\}$ of S and define $\delta_S(y) = \Sigma_{x\in S}\phi_x(y)\delta_x$. Note $\{x \in U''_S \mid \rho_S(x) \leq \delta_S\pi_S(x)\} \subset U'_S$. □

Lemma 8. *Suppose δ_S is a frontier limit function. Then the restriction of $\pi_S \times \rho_S$ to $\{x \in U_S \mid \rho_S(x) < \delta_S\pi_S(x)\}$ is a proper map to $\{(x,t) \in S \times (0,\infty) \mid t < \delta_S(x)\}$*

Proof. Let K be any compact subset of $W = \{(x,t) \in S\times(0,\infty) \mid t < \delta_S(x)\}$ and let K' be the projection of K to S. By definition we know $K'' = \pi_S^{-1}(K') \cap \{(x,t) \in S\times (0,\infty) \mid t \leq \delta_S(x)\}$ is compact. But $(\pi_S \times \rho_S)^{-1}(K) \cap \{x \in U_S \mid \rho_S(x) < \delta_S\pi_S(x)\}$ is a closed subset of K'' and hence compact. □

The following is really just a version of part of Lemma 17 of [6] which was stated in the Whitney stratified context. We rehash the proof given there which simplifies a bit since we are not simultaneously constructing the π_S.

Lemma 9. *Let X be a Thom stratified set with Thom data $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S)\}$. Then after perhaps shrinking the U_S and restricting the ρ_S and π_S we may suppose that:*

1. *If $T \prec S$ then $U_S \cap U_T = \pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U_T)$.*
2. *If $T \prec S$ then $\pi_T\pi_S = \pi_T$ and $\rho_T\pi_S = \rho_T$ on $U_S \cap U_T$.*
3. *If $U_S \cap U_T$ is nonempty, then either $S \prec T$, $T \prec S$, or $S = T$.*
4. *If $T_1 \prec T_2 \prec \cdots \prec T_\ell \prec S$ then*
$$(\rho_{T_1}, \rho_{T_2}, \ldots, \rho_{T_\ell}, \pi_{T_1})\colon S \cap U_{T_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{T_\ell} \to (0,\infty)^\ell \times T_1$$
is a strong submersion.
5. *$\pi_S \times \rho_S\colon U_S \to W_S$ is a proper map onto W_S, where $W_S = \{(x,t) \in S \times (0,\infty) \mid t < \gamma_S(x)\}$ for some smooth $\gamma_S\colon S \to (0,\infty)$.*
6. *Any compact subset of $|X|$ intersects only a finite number of the U_S.*

Proof. By Lemma 6 there is a sequence of compact subsets $K_1, K_2, \ldots$ so that $K_i \subset \mathrm{Int}K_{i+1}$ for all i and $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty K_i = |X|$. For each stratum T which does not intersect K_1, let j be the largest index so that $T \cap K_j$ is empty. Replace U_T by the smaller open neighborhood $U_T - K_j$. Now any compact set K is contained in some

K_i. If K intersects some U_S then K_i intersects U_S so K_i intersects S, but by local finiteness K_i only intersects a finite number of strata so the sixth condition holds.

The third condition is easily obtained by shrinking the U_S. We suppose by induction on i that if S and T are strata which intersect K_i and neither $T \prec S$ nor $S \preceq T$ then $U_S \cap U_T$ is empty. The inductive step shrinks the U_S leaving $U_S \cap K_i$ fixed. In the end, each U_S will still be open even though it may have been shrunk infinitely often.

Note that $U_S \cap ClS = S$ since π_S is a retraction. For each stratum S we may pick a neighborhood U''_S of S in U_S so that $ClU''_S - U_S = ClS - S$ since S and $|X| - (U_S \cup ClS)$ are disjoint closed subsets of the normal space $|X| - (ClS - S)$. We suppose by induction on k that for all strata S of dimension $< k$ we have chosen a frontier limit function γ_S so that if $U'_S = \{x \in U_S \mid \rho_S(x) < \gamma_S \pi_S(x)\}$ then $U'_S \subset U''_S$ and for any $T \prec S$ we know $\pi_S(U'_T \cap U'_S) \subset U_T$ and consequently $\pi_T \pi_S = \pi_T$ and $\rho_T \pi_S = \rho_T$ on $U'_S \cap U'_T$. For the inductive step, let S be a stratum of dimension k. We will need to find an appropriate γ_S. For each $x \in S$ pick a neighborhood W_x of x in U''_S with compact closure. Then W_x intersects only finitely many U_T. Also, if $T \prec S$ and W_x intersects ClU'_T then W_x intersects ClU''_T so W_x intersects U_T and thus this occurs for only finitely many T. Let

$$W'_x = W_x \cap \bigcap_{x \in U_T} \pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U_T) - \bigcup_{x \notin ClU'_T, T \prec S} ClU'_T.$$

By Lemma 7 we may choose γ_S so that $U'_S \subset \bigcup_{x \in S} W'_x$. Note that $\pi_S(U'_T \cap U'_S) \subset U_T$ for all $T \prec S$. (If $y \in U'_T \cap U'_S$ then $y \in W'_x$ for some x. If $x \in U_T$ then $y \in \pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U_T)$ so $\pi_S(y) \in U_T$. If $x \notin U_T$ then $x \notin ClU'_T$ so $y \notin ClU'_T$, contradiction.) So by induction we may choose γ_S for all strata.

At this point, I claim we may shrink all U_S to U'_S and the conclusions of this Lemma hold. Let us see why. For the first conclusion we must show that if $T \prec S$ then $U'_S \cap U'_T = \pi_S|_{U'_S}^{-1}(S \cap U'_T)$, i.e., $U'_S \cap U'_T = \pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U'_T) \cap U'_S$.

Suppose $x \in \pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U'_T) \cap U'_S - U'_T$ for some strata $T \prec S$. Let P be the stratum containing x. Since $\rho_S \times \pi_S$ submerses $P \cap U'_S$ we may integrate an appropriate vector field on $P \cap U'_S$ to obtain a flow $\phi_t(y)$ on $P \cap U'_S$ so that $\pi_S \phi_t(y) = \pi_S(y)$ and $\rho_S \phi_t(y) = \rho_S(y) + t$. For any y, this flow is defined for all $t \in (-\rho_S(y), \gamma_S \pi_S(y) - \rho_S(y))$ and $\lim_{t \to -\rho_S(y)} \phi_t(y) = \pi_S(y)$. Define a continuous curve $\beta\colon [0, \rho_S(x)] \to U'_S$ by $\beta(t) = \phi_{t-\rho_S(x)}(x)$ for $t > 0$ and $\beta(0) = \pi_S(x)$. Let $t_0 = \inf\{t \mid \beta(t) \notin U'_T\}$. Since U'_T is open we know $t_0 > 0$. For $t < t_0$ we know $\pi_T \beta(t) = \pi_T \pi_S \beta(t) = \pi_T \pi_S(x)$ and $\rho_T \beta(t) = \rho_T \pi_S \beta(t) = \rho_T \pi_S(x)$ are constants. But by properness of $\rho_T \times \pi_T$ on U'_T we know $\{y \in U'_T \mid \pi_T(y) = \pi_T \pi_S(x) \text{ and } \rho_T(y) = \rho_T \pi_S(x)\}$ is compact so $\beta(t_0) \in U'_T$ so $\beta(t) \in U'_T$ for t slightly larger than t_0, a contradiction. So we know $\pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U'_T) \cap U'_S \subset U'_S \cap U'_T$.

Now suppose $x \in U'_S \cap U'_T$ but $\pi_S(x) \notin U'_T$ for $T \prec S$. As above we may find a continuous $\beta\colon [0, \rho_S(x)] \to U'_S$ so that $\pi_S \beta(t) = \pi_S(x)$, $\rho_S \beta(t) = t$, and $\beta(\rho_S(x)) = x$. Let $t_0 = \sup\{t \mid \beta(t) \notin U'_T\}$. For $t > t_0$ we know as above that $\pi_T \beta(t)$ and $\rho_T \beta(t)$ are constant so $\beta(t_0) \in U'_T$, a contradiction. So $U'_S \cap U'_T = \pi_S^{-1}(S \cap U'_T) \cap U'_S$.

The second condition is immediate and we already shrunk to satisfy the third condition. For the fourth condition we must show that if $T_1 \prec T_2 \prec \cdots \prec T_\ell \prec S$ then $(\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_\ell, \pi_{T_1})\colon S \cap U'_{T_1} \cap \cdots \cap U'_{T_\ell} \to (0, \infty)^\ell \times T_1$ is a strong submersion. Note this map is the composition of the strong submersions $\rho_{T_\ell} \times \pi_{T_\ell}\colon S \cap U'_{T_1} \cap$

$\cdots \cap U'_{T_\ell} \to (0,\infty) \times T_\ell$ and $id \times (\rho_{T_1}, \rho_{T_2}, \ldots, \rho_{T_{\ell-1}}, \pi_{T_1})$. The fifth condition is a consequence of Lemma 8 and we already shrunk to satisfy the sixth. □

We say $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ is enhanced Thom data for X if it satisfies the conclusions of Lemma 9.

It is often convenient to reparameterize the distance functions ρ_S.

Lemma 10. *Suppose $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ is enhanced Thom data for a Thom stratified set X. For each stratum S, suppose we pick a smooth $\gamma'_S \colon S \to (0,\infty)$ and a smooth parameterized family of diffeomorphisms $\kappa_{S,y} \colon [0, \gamma_S(y)) \to [0, \gamma'_S(y))$ for $y \in S$. Define $\rho'_S(x) = \kappa_{S,\pi_S(x)}\rho_S(x)$. Then $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho'_S, \gamma'_S)\}$ is enhanced Thom data for X.*

In particular, if we set $\gamma'_S = 1$ everywhere and let $\kappa_{S,y}(t) = t/\gamma_S(y)$ we see that any Thom stratified set has enhanced Thom data with all γ_S the constant 1.

Proof. Conditions 1, 3, and 6 in Lemma 9 are immediate since U_S is unchanged. By definition of smooth parameterization, the map

$$\kappa_S \colon \{(x,t) \in S \times (0,\infty) \mid t < \gamma_S(x)\} \to \{(x,t) \in S \times (0,\infty) \mid t < \gamma'_S(x)\}$$

given by $\kappa_S(x,t) = (x, \kappa_{S,x}(t))$ is smooth and by the inverse function theorem is a diffeomorphism, so condition 5 holds. Condition 2 follows since

$$\rho'_T \pi_S(x) = \kappa_{T,\pi_T(\pi_S(x))}\rho_T(\pi_S(x)) = \kappa_{T,\pi_T(x)}\rho_T(x) = \rho'_T(x).$$

Condition 4 with $\ell = 1$ follows since $(\pi_{T_1}, \rho'_{T_1}) = \kappa_{T_1}(\pi_{T_1}, \rho_{T_1})$ and is hence a strong submersion. Condition 4 for all ℓ follows by induction as in the proof of Lemma 9. □

Lemma 11. *Suppose $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ is enhanced Thom data for X. Suppose also that we have for each stratum S of X a smooth $\delta_S \colon S \to \mathbb{R}$ so that $\gamma_S(x) > \delta_S(x) > 0$ for all $x \in S$. Then there is a smooth proper map $r \colon |X| \to \mathbb{R}$ so that $r\pi_S(x) = r(x)$ whenever $\rho_S(x) \le \delta_S\pi_S(x)$.*

Proof. After reparameterizing using Lemma 10 we may as well suppose that $\gamma_S = 1$ and $\delta_S = 1/2$ everywhere. For example use the reparameterization

$$\kappa_{S,y}(t) = (\gamma_S(y) - \delta_S(y))t/((\gamma_S(y) - 2\delta_S(y))t + \delta_S(y)\gamma_S(y)).$$

We will find below a sequence of smooth functions $r_i \colon |X| \to [0,1]$ so that:

- For each i, $r_i^{-1}(0)$ is compact.
- If $j > i$ then $r_i^{-1}([0,1)) \subset r_j^{-1}(0)$.
- For any $x \in |X|$ there is an i so that $r_i(x) < 1$.
- For each i and stratum S, if $x \in \rho_S^{-1}([0,1/2])$ then $r_i(x) = r_i\pi_S(x)$.

Given these r_i we just let $r = \Sigma r_i$. Note r is well defined, for any $x \in |X|$, pick i so $r_i(x) < 1$. Then $r_j(y) = 0$ for all $j > i$ and y near x, so $r(y) = \Sigma_{j=1}^{i} r_j(y)$. In fact if $r_i(x) \in (0,1)$ then $r(y) = i - 1 + r_i(y)$ for y near x. To see r is proper, note that $r^{-1}([0,n]) \subset r_{n+1}^{-1}(0)$ which is compact.

So let us find the r_i. For each $x \in |X|$ pick a smooth function $q_x \colon |X| \to [0,1]$ as follows. Let S be the lowest dimensional stratum so that $x \in U_S$ and $\rho_S(x) \le 1/2$. Choose a smooth function $p \colon S \to [0,1]$ with compact support so that:

- For all y in some neighborhood of $\pi_S(x)$ in S, $p(y) = 1$.
- If $T \prec S$ and $y \in S \cap \rho_T^{-1}([0,1/2])$ then $p(y) = 0$.

Now choose some smooth $\alpha\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ so that $\alpha(t) = 1$ for $t < 3/5$ and $\alpha(t) = 0$ for $t > 4/5$. We then define $q_x(y) = p\pi_S(y)\alpha\rho_S(y)$ for $y \in U_S$ and $q_x(y) = 0$ for $y \notin U_S$. Note that q_x has compact support and is 1 on a neighborhood of x. Also for any T, if $y \in \rho_T^{-1}([0,1/2])$ then $q_x\pi_T(y) = q_x(y)$. This is trivial if $y \notin U_S$ or $T \prec S$ since both sides are 0. If $y \in U_S$ and $T = S$ then $q_x\pi_S(y) = p\pi_S(y) = q_x(y)$ and if $y \in U_S$ and $S \prec T$ then

$$q_x\pi_T(y) = p\pi_S\pi_T(y)\alpha\rho_S\pi_T(y) = p\pi_S(y)\alpha\rho_S(y) = q_x(y).$$

Let V_x denote the interior of $q_x^{-1}(1)$ which is an open neighborhood of x.

By Lemma 6 there is a countable sequence of compact subsets $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \cdots$ so that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i = |X|$. Suppose now we have constructed $r_1, \ldots, r_{i-1}$ so that:

- For each $j < i$, $1 - r_j$ has compact support.
- If $k < j < i$ then $r_k^{-1}([0,1)) \subset r_j^{-1}(0)$.
- For each $j < i$, $K_j \subset r_j^{-1}(0)$.
- For each $j < i$ and stratum S, if $x \in \rho_S^{-1}([0,1/2])$ then $r_j(x) = r_j\pi_S(x)$.

By compactness of $K_i \cup Clr_{i-1}^{-1}([0,1))$ we may choose a finite number of points $z_1, \ldots, z_k$ so that$K_i \cup Clr_{i-1}^{-1}([0,1)) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} V_{z_j}$. We define $r_i(y) = \Pi_{j=1}^{k}(1 - q_{z_j}(y))$. Note the support of $1 - r_i$ is contained in the union of the supports of the q_{z_j} and is hence compact. Note that r_i is 0 on any V_{z_j} and hence $K_i \cup r_{i-1}^{-1}([0,1)) \subset r_i^{-1}(0)$ and consequently $r_j^{-1}([0,1)) \subset r_i^{-1}(0)$ for all $j < i$. So we can continue the construction for all i.

It only remains to show the r_i have the required properties. We know $r_i^{-1}(0)$ is compact since it is a closed subset of the support of $1 - r_i$ which is compact. Any $x \in |X|$ is contained in some K_i and so $r_i(x) = 0$. □

5. Untico Resolution Towers for Thom stratified sets

Suppose we have a tico A in a manifold M, i.e., A is an immersed codimension one submanifold of M in general position with itself. We could split M along A and obtain a manifold with convex corners. With this analogy in mind we define an untico in a manifold Z with convex corners to be the closure of a union of connected components of $\partial_1 Z$.

An untico resolution tower is analogous to a resolution tower as defined in [1], except that instead of ticos in manifolds we have unticos in manifolds with convex corners. So we have a partially ordered index set which we may as well take to be the strata of a stratified set X with the partial order $\prec$ and for each index S a manifold V_S with convex corners on the boundary and for each $T \prec S$ an untico $V_{TS} \subset V_S$ and a proper map $p_{TS}\colon V_{TS} \to V_T$ so that:

(1) If $V_{TS} \cap V_{PS}$ is nonempty then either $T \prec P$, or $P \prec T$, or $P = T$. Moreover, $p_{TS}(V_{TS} \cap V_{PS}) \subset V_{PT}$ if $P \prec T \prec S$.
(2) If $P \prec T \prec S$ then $p_{PT}p_{TS}(x) = p_{PS}(x)$ for all $x \in V_{TS} \cap V_{PS}$.
(3) If $P \preceq T \prec S$ then $p_{TS}^{-1}(\bigcup_{Q \prec P} V_{QT}) = \bigcup_{Q \prec P} V_{QS} \cap V_{TS}$.
(4) Any depth 1 point of V_S is in at most one V_{TS}.
(5) If $T \prec S$ then $Clp_{TS}^{-1}(\partial_k V_T - \bigcup_{P \prec T} V_{PT}) = Cl(\partial_k V_S - \bigcup_{P \prec S} V_{PS}) \cap V_{TS}$.
(6) The index set is countable and for each T there are only finitely many S so that $T \prec S$.

Conditions 1 through 5 are the analogues of conditions I through V in the definition of resolution tower in [1]. The last condition 6 does not appear in the

definition of resolution tower in [1] but probably should have since it is essential for the realization to be locally compact and second countable.

As in [1] the realization of an untico resolution tower is the quotient space $\bigcup V_S/\sim$ where $\sim$ is the equivalence relation generated by $x \sim p_{TS}(x)$ for $x \in V_{TS}$.

Lemma 12. *The realization of an untico resolution tower $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ is a stratified set with strata $V_S - \bigcup_{T\prec S} V_{TS}$.*

Proof. For each S, let $V'_S = V_S - \bigcup_{T\prec S} V_{TS}$. Let Z denote the realization, let $q\colon \bigcup V_S \to Z$ be the quotient map and let $q_S = q|_{V_S}$. Pick any $z \in Z$. Then $z = q(y)$ for some $y \in V_S$. We may as well choose such a y so that S has the smallest dimension possible. We cannot have $y \in V_{TS}$ for any T since that would mean $z = q(y')$ where $y' = p_{TS}(y) \in V_T$ and T has smaller dimension than S. So $y \in V'_S$.

Suppose $y \sim x$ for some $y \in V'_S$ and $x \in V'_P$ and $y \neq x$. There must be some points $y_i \in V_{S_i}$, $i = 0, \ldots, k$ so that $y = y_0$, $x = y_k$ and for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$ either $y_i = p_{S_iS_{i-1}}(y_{i-1})$ or $y_{i-1} = p_{S_{i-1}S_i}(y_i)$. Take such a sequence where k is as small as possible. We cannot have $y_1 = p_{S_1S_0}(y_0)$ since $y \notin V_{S_1S}$, so $y = p_{SS_1}(y_1)$. We cannot have $y_1 = p_{S_1S_2}(y_2)$ since then $y = p_{SS_2}(y_2)$ and a shorter sequence is possible. So $y_2 = p_{S_2S_1}(y_1)$ and thus $y_1 \in V_{S_2S_1}$ and so $y = p_{SS_1}(y_1) \in V_{S_2S}$, a contradiction.

So we know Z can be decomposed into the disjoint manifolds V'_S. We must show all the conditions for this decomposition to be a stratified set. The reader can no doubt simplify the argument I give below which seems more involved than it should be.

If $T \preceq S$ we define the height of S above T as the maximal k so that there are $S_0, \ldots, S_k$ with $T = S_0$, $S = S_k$, and $S_0 \prec S_1 \prec \cdots \prec S_k$.

Let us show Z is locally compact. So take any $z \in Z$, then $z = q_T(x)$ with $x \in V'_T$ for some T. Take an open neighborhood W_T of x in V'_T so that ClW_T is a compact subset of V'_T. Suppose by induction we have found open sets W_S in V_S for all strata S of height $< k$ above T so that ClW_S is compact and if $Q \prec S$ then $p^{-1}_{QS}(W_Q) = W_S \cap V_{QS}$ if $T \preceq Q$ and $W_S \cap V_{QS}$ is empty otherwise. Take any stratum S of height k above T. Let $C_S = \bigcup_{T\preceq Q\prec S} p^{-1}_{QS}(W_Q)$. Since each p_{QS} is proper and there are only finitely many Q above T we know that ClC_S is compact. Suppose $x \in C_S \cap V_{QS}$ for some Q with $Q \prec S$ and $x \notin p^{-1}_{QS}(W_Q)$ if $T \preceq Q$. Then $x \in p^{-1}_{PS}(W_P)$ for some $P \neq Q$ with $T \preceq P \prec S$. Since $x \in V_{PS} \cap V_{QS}$ we know either $P \prec Q$ or $Q \prec P$. If $P \prec Q$ we know $p_{QS}(x) \in p^{-1}_{PQ}(W_P)$ so $p_{QS}(x) \in W_Q$ a contradiction. If $Q \prec P$ we know $p_{PS}(x) \in W_P \cap V_{QP}$ so $T \preceq Q$ and $p_{PS}(x) \in p^{-1}_{QP}(W_Q)$ and thus $p_{QS}(x) \in W_Q$, a contradiction. So $C_S \cap V_{QS} = p^{-1}_{QS}(W_Q)$ for all $T \preceq Q \prec S$ and $C_S \cap V_{QS}$ is empty otherwise. Take a compact neighborhood W'_S of ClC_S in V_S. Now let W_S be an open neighborhood of C_S in $\mathrm{Int}W'_S$ so that $W_S \cap V_{QS} = C_S \cap V_{QS}$ for all $Q \prec S$. So by induction we know we can find W_S for all $T \preceq S$. Then $\bigcup_{T\preceq S} q_S(W_S)$ is an open neighborhood of z in Z. Its closure is compact since it is contained in the compact set $\bigcup_{T\preceq S} q_S(ClW_S)$. So Z is locally compact.

Let us now show Z is Hausdorff. Take $z \neq z'$ in Z. We have $x \in V'_T$ and $x' \in V'_{T'}$ for some T and T' so that $z = q_T(x)$ and $z' = q_{T'}(x')$. Just as above we construct W_S for all $T \preceq S$ and W'_S for all $T' \preceq S$. We must just make sure that each $W_S \cap W'_S$ is empty.

Now let us show second countability. First put a metric d_S on each V_S. For each T we can take a countable basis $\{W_{Ti}\}$ of V'_T with each ClW_{Ti} a compact subset of V'_T. We introduce another integer index j. As above, for each S with $T \prec S$ and each i, j we construct an open subset W_{TSij} of V_S with compact closure, starting with $W_{TTij} = W_{Ti}$. The only extra bit is we make sure that W_{TSij} lies within distance $1/j$ of $C_{TSij} = \bigcup_{T \preceq Q \prec S} p_{QS}^{-1}(W_{TQij})$ and if $j > 1$ we require that $W_{TSij} \subset W_{TSij-1}$. We then claim the countable collection of open sets $U_{Tij} = \bigcup_{T \preceq S} q_S(W_{TSij})$ is a basis for the topology of Z. So take any open set $O \subset Z$ and any $z \in O$. Suppose $z = q_T(x)$ for $x \in V'_T$. Start out by choosing i so that $x \in W_{Ti}$ and $ClW_{Ti} \subset q_T^{-1}(O)$. We suppose by induction on k that we have a sequence of integers $j_0 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_k$ so that for any S of height $\ell \leq k$ above T we have $ClW_{TSij} \subset q_S^{-1}(O)$ for all $j \geq j_\ell$. To complete the induction, note that if S has height $k+1$ above T then $ClC_{TSij_k} \subset q_S^{-1}(O)$ since if $T \prec Q \prec S$ then $Clp_{QS}^{-1}(W_{TQij_k}) \subset p_{QS}^{-1} q_Q^{-1}(O) \subset q_S^{-1}(O)$. So we need only choose j_{k+1} so that for each S of height $k+1$ above T, the set of points of distance $\leq 1/j_{k+1}$ from C_{TSij_k} is contained in $q_S^{-1}(O)$. Finally, if k is the maximum height above T we know that $x \in U_{Tij_k} \subset O$. □

I presume the realization of an untico resolution tower is a Thom stratified set, if perhaps one puts a few simple restrictions on the tower, but haven't bothered to think about it to discover what restrictions, if any, are needed. However we will show that any Thom stratified set is the realization of an untico resolution tower. The construction is quite simple. For each stratum S let δ_S be a frontier limit function. Then we set

$$\begin{aligned} V_S &= S - \bigcup_{T \prec S} \{x \in U_T \mid \rho_T(x) < \delta_T \pi_T(x)\} \\ V_{TS} &= \{x \in V_S \cap U_T \mid \rho_T(x) = \delta_T \pi_T(x)\} \\ p_{TS} &= \pi_T|_{V_{TS}} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 13. *Suppose $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ is enhanced Thom data for a Thom stratified set X. Suppose for each stratum S of X we choose a smooth $\delta_S \colon S \to (0, \infty)$ so that $\delta_S < \gamma_S$ everywhere. Then the above $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ is an untico resolution tower with realization $|X|$. Moreover, this tower has some special properties:*

1. *Each V_{TS} is itself a manifold with convex corners on the boundary (i.e., it has no interior creases).*
2. *If $P \prec T \prec S$ then $p_{TS}^{-1}(V_{PT}) = V_{PS} \cap V_{TS}$.*
3. *Each p_{TS} is a strong submersion.*
4. *Up to isomorphism, the tower is independent of the choice of δ_S.*

Proof. For convenience, we may as well reparameterize using Lemma 10 so that $\delta_S = 1/2$ and $\gamma_S = 1$ are both constant.

Take any $x \in V_S$ and let $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ be all the strata with $\rho_{T_i}(x) = 1/2$. Let ℓ be the depth of x in S. Since $\rho_{T_1} \times \cdots \times \rho_{T_k}$ is a strong submersion near x we can choose local coordinates y near x so that $\rho_{T_i}(y) = 1/2 + y_i$ and S is given by $y_i \geq 0$, $i = k+1, \ldots, k+\ell$. Then near x, V_S is given by the inequalities $y_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, k+\ell$ and so V_S has convex corners and the depth of x in V_S is $k+\ell$. If $x \in V_{TS}$ then after reordering, $T = T_1$ and V_{TS} is locally given by the equations $y_1 = 0$, $y_i \geq 0$ for $i = 2, \ldots k+\ell$. Thus V_{TS} is a manifold with convex corners on the boundary. If x has depth 0 in V_{TS} then $\ell = 0$ and $k = 1$, thus the depth

0 points of V_{TS} are a union of connected components of the depth 1 points of V_S. So V_{TS} is a union of closures of components of the depth 1 points of V_S. If x has depth 1 in V_S then either $k = 1$ and $\ell = 0$ in which case $x \in V_{T_1 S}$ and x is in no other V_{TS}, or $k = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ in which case x is in no V_{TS}.

If $x \in V_{TS} \cap V_{PS}$ for $P \neq T$ then after reordering, $T = T_1$ and $P = T_2$. Since $x \in U_P \cap U_T$ we know either $P \prec T$ or $T \prec P$. Suppose $P \prec T$. For any $Q \prec T$ we have

$$\rho_Q p_{TS}(x) = \rho_Q \pi_T(x) = \rho_Q(x) \geq 1/2$$

and thus $p_{TS}(x) \in V_T$. Also $\rho_P p_{TS}(x) = \rho_P(x) = 1/2$ so $p_{TS}(x) \in V_{PT}$. We also have $p_{PT} p_{TS}(x) = \pi_P \pi_T(x) = \pi_P(x) = p_{PS}(x)$.

Now suppose $x \in V_{TS}$ and $p_{TS}(x) \in V_{PT}$. Then $1/2 = \rho_P p_{TS}(x) = \rho_P \pi_T(x) = \rho_P(x)$ so $x \in V_{PS}$.

Finally we must show p_{TS} is a strong submersion. Take any $x \in V_{TS}$ and let $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ be all the strata with $\rho_{T_i}(x) = 1/2$. Order so that $T_1 \prec T_2 \prec \cdots \prec T_k$. We know $T = T_n$ for some n. Since $\rho_{T_1} \times \cdots \times \rho_{T_{n-1}}$ submerses T we can choose cooordinates z near $\pi_T(x)$ so that in these coordinates, T is given by the inequalities $z_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ and $\rho_{T_i}(z) = 1/2 + z_{\ell+i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ where ℓ is the depth of $\pi_T(x)$ in T (so ℓ is also the depth of x in S). Since $\pi_{T_n} \times \rho_{T_n} \times \rho_{T_{n+1}} \times \cdots \rho_{T_k}$ is a strong submersion we know by Lemma 2 we can choose coordinates y near x so that in these coordinates S is given by $y_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, π_T is given by projection to the z coordinates (i.e., if $m = \dim T$ the z_i coordinate of $\pi_T(y)$ is y_i for $i \leq m$), and $\rho_{T_i}(y) = 1/2 + y_{m+i-n+1}$ for $i = n, \ldots, k$. Since $\rho_{T_i} = \rho_{T_i} \pi_T$ for $i < n$ we also know that $\rho_{T_i}(y) = 1/2 + y_{\ell+i}$ for all $i < n$. We now see that p_{TS} is a strong submersion. In particular, V_T is given by the inequalities $z_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell + n - 1, m+1, m+2, \ldots, m+k-n+1$, V_{TS} is given by the inequalities $y_{m+1} = 0$, $y_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell + n - 1, m+2, m+3, \ldots, m+k-n+1$, and p_{TS} is given by projection.

So we have shown that $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ is an untico resolution tower with some very special properties.

Let us now show that its realization is $|X|$. By Lemma 11 there is a smooth proper map $r \colon |X| \to [0, \infty)$ so that for all strata S and $x \in \rho_S^{-1}([0, 2/3])$, $r\pi_S(x) = r(x)$.

For any $s \in (0, 1/2]$ let $V_S^s = S - \bigcup_{T \prec S} \{x \in U_T \mid \rho_T(x) < s\}$ and $V_{TS}^s = \{x \in V_S^s \cap U_T \mid \rho_T(x) = s\}$. Thus $V_S = V_S^{1/2}$ and $V_{TS} = V_{TS}^{1/2}$. We will define a vector field v on $|X|$ whose flow ϕ_t is continuous, so that $\phi_t(V_S^s) = V_T^{s-t}$ and $\phi_t(V_{TS}^s) = V_{TS}^{s-t}$ for $t \in [0, s)$, so that $dr(v) = 0$, so that $\pi_S \phi_t = \phi_t \pi_S$ and so $\lim_{t \to 1/2} \phi_t(x)$ exists for all $x \in V_S$ and the limits give a continuous map $\phi_{1/2} \colon V_S \to ClS$ so that for $x \in V_{TS}$, $\phi_{1/2}(x) = \phi_{1/2} \pi_T(x)$. Moreover $\phi_{1/2}$ restricts to a diffeomorphism of $V_S - \bigcup_{T \prec S} V_{TS}$ to S. Consequently, $\phi_{1/2}$ induces an isomorphism of the realization of the resolution tower to $|X|$.

To construct v it suffices to construct for each stratum S a smooth vector field v_S on S so that:

- v_S is tangent to $\partial_k S$ for each k,
- $dr(v_S) = 0$,
- $d\rho_T(v_S(x)) = -1$ and $d\pi_T(v_S(x)) = v_T(\pi_T(x))$ if $x \in \rho_T^{-1}((0, 1/2])$,
- $d\rho_T(v_S(x)) \geq -1$ if $x \in \rho_T^{-1}((1/2, 1))$.

Furthermore it suffices to construct such a v_S locally and piece together with a partition of unity.

So suppose we have constructed v_T for all $T \prec S$. Take any $y \in S$ and let us construct v_S locally around y. Let $T_1 \prec T_2 \prec \cdots \prec T_k$ be all the strata so that $y \in U_{T_i}$. Let j be the highest index so that $\rho_{T_j}(y) \leq 1/2$. If there is no such j we may locally set $v_S = 0$. Since $\pi_{T_j} \times \rho_{T_j} \times \cdots \times \rho_{T_k}$ is a strong submersion we may choose v_S locally so that $d\pi_{T_j}(v_S) = v_{T_j}$, $d\rho_{T_j}(v_S) = -1$, and $d\rho_{T_i}(v_S) = 0$ for $i > j$. Note $dr(v_S) = drd\pi_{T_j}(v_S) = dr(v_{T_j}) = 0$. Also for $i < j$ we have $d\rho_{T_i}(v_S) = d\rho_{T_i}d\pi_{T_j}(v_S) = d\rho_{T_i}(v_{T_j}) \geq -1$ and is $= -1$ if $\rho_{T_i}(x) \leq 1/2$. Also if $\rho_{T_i}(x) \leq 1/2$ then $d\pi_{T_i}(v_S) = d\pi_{T_i}d\pi_{T_j}(v_S) = d\pi_{T_i}(v_{T_j}) = v_{T_i}$.

We must now show the tower is independent of the choice of δ_S so suppose we made other choices δ'_S. It suffices to prove the case where $\delta'_S < \delta_S$ everywhere since we can always choose a third δ''_S less than both. We may as well reparameterize so that $\delta'_S = 1/4$, $\delta_S = 1/2$, and $\gamma_S = 1$ everywhere. Then note that the untico resolution tower $\{V'_S, V'_{TS}, p'_{TS}\}$ we get using δ'_S is exactly $V'_S = V_S^{1/4}$, $V'_{TS} = V_{TS}^{1/4}$ and $p'_{TS} = \pi_S|_{V'_{TS}}$. Then the map $\phi_{1/4}\colon V_S \to V'_S$ gives an isomorphism of the untico resolution towers. Note $\phi_{1/4}p_{TS}(x) = \phi_{1/4}\pi_S(x) = \pi_S\phi_{1/4}(x) = p'_{TS}\phi_{1/4}(x)$ for all $x \in V_{TS}$. □

An earlier version of the paper required the following result. It is no longer required, but we include it anyway. It could be easily generalized to have q be any proper strong submersion to a manifold Q with convex corners on the boundary, and then $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ would fiber over Q, but let's keep it simple.

Lemma 14. *Suppose $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ is enhanced Thom data for a Thom stratified set X and $q\colon |X| \to [0,1]$ is a proper map which restricts to a strong submersion on each stratum of X so that $q\pi_S = q|_{U_S}$ for all strata S. Let $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ be the resulting untico resolution tower of X. Then there is an untico resolution tower $\{V'_S, V'_{TS}, p'_{TS}\}$ so that $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ is isomorphic to $\{V'_S, V'_{TS}, p'_{TS}\} \times [0,1]$. In particular, for each stratum S there are diffeomorphisms $h_S\colon V'_S \times [0,1] \to V_S$ so that $qh_S(x,t) = t$, $h_S(V'_{TS} \times [0,1]) = V_{TS}$, and $p_{TS}h_S(x,t) = h_T(p'_{TS}(x), t)$. Moreover $\{V'_S, V'_{TS}, p'_{TS}\}$ is an untico resolution tower for any of the Thom stratified sets $X \cap q^{-1}(t)$ with Thom data obtained by restricting π_S and ρ_S to $U_S \cap q^{-1}(t)$.*

Proof. As usual, we may as well suppose that $\gamma_S = 1$. The next step is to find a controlled vector field v on $|X|$ so that $dq(v) = 1$. In particular, for each stratum S of X we want a smooth vector field v_S on S so that

- $dq(v_S) = 1$.
- If $T \prec S$, $x \in S \cap U_T$ and $\rho_T(x) \leq 1/2$ then $d\pi_T v_S(x) = v_T\pi_T(x)$ and $d\rho_T v_S(x) = 0$.

It suffices to find v_S locally and piece together with a partition of unity and it is easy to find v_S locally, c.f., the proof of Lemma 13. Now integrate the v_S to find a flow ϕ_t on $|X|$. Let $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ be the untico resolution tower we obtain using $\delta_S = 1/2$. Note that ϕ_t leaves each V_S and V_{TS} invariant and we may set $V'_S = V_S \cap q^{-1}(0)$, $V'_{TS} = V_{TS} \cap q^{-1}(0)$, $p'_{TS} = p_{TS}|_{V'_{TS}}$, and $h_S(x,t) = \phi_t(x)$. □

6. Whitney stratified subsets

A stratified set X is a Whitney stratified subset of a smooth manifold M with convex corners on the boundary if $|X| \subset M$ and all strata of X are smooth submanifolds of M so that:

- Each stratum has boundary compatible with M.
- If $T \neq S$ are strata of X and $x \in T \cap ClS$ then (T, S) satisfies the Whitney conditions A and B at x which we define below.

Let us recall the Whitney conditions. Suppose S and T are disjoint smooth submanifolds of some smooth manifold M with convex corners on the boundary and both S and T have boundary compatible with M. We say that (T, S) satisfies the Whitney conditions at a point $x \in T$ if

- Condition A: Whenever $x_i \in S$ is a sequence converging to x so that the tangent spaces $T_{x_i}S$ of S converge to some subspace L of T_xM, then $T_xT \subset L$, the tangent space of T at x is contained in L.
- Condition B: Whenever $x_i \in S$ is a sequence converging to x and $x_i' \in T$ is a sequence converging to x so that the tangent spaces $T_{x_i}S$ of S converge to some subspace L of T_xM and the secant lines x_ix_i' converge to some line ℓ in T_xM, then $\ell \subset L$.

In the above, the secant lines are taken in some local coordinates, it doesn't matter which. Also, condition A is superfluous, it is implied by B (just let x_i approach x much faster than x_i' and ℓ can be any vector in T_xT). However, it is sometimes useful to prove condition A anyway as this will help when proving B.

We say that (T, S) satisfies the Whitney conditions if it satisfies them at every point $x \in T$.

Whitney stratified sets have Thom data and hence are Thom stratified sets. The reader should be able to adapt any standard proof of this to our convex corner generalization of Whitney stratified set, but we prove it here anyway. In particular, in [6] we proved a stronger result- that if you choose any ρ_S you wish, subject to a mild condition that each ρ_S look locally like a squared distance function, then you may construct π_S so that $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S)\}$ is Thom data.

Statements and proofs given in the Whitney appendix of [6] remain true for the convex corner case as long as we make the following modifications:

- Manifolds are allowed to have convex corners on the boundary but submanifolds are required to have compatible boundary.
- Replace submersion with strong submersion. Keep in mind that Lemma 4 above shows that a depth preserving submersion is a strong submersion.
- Specify that maps preserve depth where appropriate.
- Replace parameter domains $V \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with $V \subset [0, \infty)^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^{m-\ell}$.

We reproduce the suitably modified statements of the results below. The proofs will be the same as in [6] once the above modifications are made. We start by recalling some definitions from [6], suitably modified.

Suppose M is a smooth manifold with convex corners on the boundary, N is a smooth submanifold of M whose boundary is compatible with M, and $\rho\colon U \to [0, \infty)$ is a smooth function from an open neighborhood U of N in M. We say that ρ is *distancelike* around N if:

- At every point of N the Hessian of ρ has rank equal to the codimension of N.

- $N \subset \rho^{-1}(0)$.

Lemma 6 of [6] gives a local description of a distancelike function. Suppose $z \in N$ and $h\colon (V, V \cap N, z) \to [0,\infty)^k \times (\mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times \mathbb{R}^{m-n}, \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times 0, 0)$ is a coordinate chart around z. Then there is a symmetric matrix valued function $L(x,y)$ so that $\rho h^{-1}(x,y) = y^T L(x,y) y$ and every $L(x,0)$ is positive definite. After shrinking V and changing the y coordinate you then get $\rho h^{-1}(x,y) = |y|^2$.

Lemma 14 of [6] is modified to:

Lemma 15. *Suppose M is a smooth manifold with convex corners on the boundary, T and S are submanifolds of M with compatible boundary, (T,S) satisfies the Whitney conditions, U is a neighborhood of T in M, $\rho\colon U \to [0,\infty)$ is distancelike around T, and $\pi\colon U \to T$ is a smooth retraction which preserves depth. Then there is a neighborhood U' of T in U so that $\rho \times \pi|\colon U' \cap S \to (0,\infty) \times T$ is a strong submersion.*

Lemmas 7 and 8 above take the place of Lemma 16 of [6]. Much of Lemma 17 of [6] is contained in Lemma 9 but the rest of it is modified to:

Lemma 16. *Suppose M and N are smooth manifolds with convex corners on the boundary, X is a Whitney stratified subset of M, $q\colon M \to N$ is a strong submersion which preserves depth, and q restricts to a strong submersion on each stratum of X. Suppose that for each stratum S of X we choose a distancelike function $\rho_S\colon U_S'' \to [0,\infty)$ around S. Moreover, suppose that there is a closed set $Y \subset |X|$ and for each stratum S we have a (possibly empty) neighborhood U_S' of $Y \cap S$ in U_S'' and a smooth retraction $\pi_S'\colon U_S' \to S \cap U_S'$ so that $q\pi_S' = q$ and if $T \prec S$ then $\pi_T'\pi_S' = \pi_T'$ and $\rho_T\pi_S' = \rho_T$ on ${\pi_S'}^{-1}(U_T') \cap U_T'$. Then there are neighborhoods U_S of S in U_S'' and smooth retractions $\pi_S\colon U_S \to S$ so that $q\pi_S = q|_{U_S}$ for all strata S and $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S|_{U_S})\}$ is Thom data for X.*

The proof of Lemma 16 uses the technical Lemma 13 of [6] and the notion of locally linear. Suppose X, Y, and Z are smooth manifolds with convex corners on the boundary, $Y \subset X$ is a submanifold with boundary compatible with X, and $f\colon U \to Z$ is a smooth map where $U \subset X$ is open. We say f is locally linear with respect to Y if for every $x \in U \cap Y$ we may choose local coordinates $g\colon (V,x) \to [0,\infty)^k \times (\mathbb{R}^m, 0)$ and $h\colon (W, f(x)) \to [0,\infty)^\ell \times (\mathbb{R}^n, 0)$ so that $V \cap Y = g^{-1}([0,\infty)^k \times E)$ for some linear subspace E of $\mathbb{R}^m$, $hfg^{-1}(y,z) = L(y,z)$ for some linear transformation $L\colon \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^\ell \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and $f^{-1}f(x)$ is transverse to Y, i.e., $L(\mathbb{R}^k \times E) = L(\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m)$. Then Lemma 13 of [6] becomes:

Lemma 17. *Suppose M is a smooth manifold with convex corners on the boundary, $N \subset M$ is a smooth submanifold with boundary compatible with M, $\{U_i\}_{i \in A}$ is a locally finite collection of open subsets of M, $q_i\colon U_i \to Z_i$ are smooth maps to manifolds Z_i, and $C_i \subset M$ are closed subsets so that $C_i \subset U_i$. For each nonempty subset $D \subset A$ with $\bigcap_{i\in D} U_i$ nonempty we suppose that the map $\Pi_{i\in D} q_i\colon \bigcap_{i\in D} U_i \to \Pi_{i\in D} Z_i$ is locally linear with respect to N. Suppose $Y \subset N$ and $K \subset N$ are closed subsets of N, U is a neighborhood of Y in M, and $\sigma\colon U \to U \cap N$ is a smooth retraction so that σ preserves depth and $q_i\sigma(x) = q_i(x)$ for all i and all x in $U_i \cap \sigma^{-1}(U_i \cap N)$. Then there is a neighborhood V of $K \cup Y$ in M and a smooth retraction $\pi\colon V \to V \cap N$ so that:*

1. *$\pi(x) = \sigma(x)$ for all x in some neighborhood of Y.*
2. *$q_i\pi(x) = q_i(x)$ for all i and all x in some neighborhood of $C_i \cap \pi^{-1}(C_i \cap N)$.*

(3) π *preserves depth.*

The generalization of the following Lemma to Thom stratified sets is of course false. For example, take nondiffeomorphic compact manifolds M and M' with diffeomorphic interiors. Then $M/\partial M$ and $M'/\partial M'$ are isomorphic stratified sets but if we take ρ and ρ' arising from collars of M and M' respectively the untico resolution towers differ. One is $V_1 = M, V_0 = *, V_{01} = \partial M$ and the other is $V_1' = M', V_0 = *, V_{01}' = \partial M'$.

Lemma 18. *Suppose X is a Whitney stratified subset of a smooth compact manifold M with convex corners on the boundary and $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S)\}$ and $\{(U_S', \pi_S', \rho_S')\}$ are two sets of Thom data for X so that all ρ_S and ρ_S' are distancelike. Then the two untico resolution towers $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ and $\{V_S', V_{TS}', p_{TS}'\}$ we obtain are isomorphic.*

Proof. Consider the Whitney stratified set $X \times [0,1]$ in $M \times [0,1]$. Choose a smooth $\alpha\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ so that $\alpha(t) = 1$ for all $t > 3/4$ and $\alpha(t) = 0$ for all $t < 1/4$. For each stratum $S \times [0,1]$ of $X \times [0,1]$ let $\rho''_{S\times[0,1]}$ be the distancelike function

$$\rho''_{S\times[0,1]}(x,t) = \alpha(t)\rho_S(x) + (1-\alpha(t))\rho_S'(x)$$

on $(U_S \cap U_S') \times [0,1]$. By Lemmas 16 and 9 there are smooth retractions $\pi''_{S\times[0,1]}\colon U''_{S\times[0,1]} \to S \times [0,1]$ and smooth $\gamma''_{S\times[0,1]}\colon S \times [0,1] \to (0,\infty)$ so that:

- $\{(U''_{S\times[0,1]}, \pi''_{S\times[0,1]}, \rho''_{S\times[0,1]}, \gamma''_{S\times[0,1]})\}$ is enhanced Thom data for $X \times [0,1]$.
- $\pi''_{S\times[0,1]}(x,1) = (\pi_S(x), 1)$ for all $(x,1) \in U''_{S\times[0,1]}$.
- $\pi''_{S\times[0,1]}(x,0) = (\pi_S'(x), 0)$ for all $(x,0) \in U''_{S\times[0,1]}$.
- $q\pi''_{S\times[0,1]}(x,t) = t$ where $q\colon M \times [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is projection.

Let $\{V_S'', V_{TS}'', p_{TS}''\}$ be the untico resolution tower we obtain using the enhanced Thom data $\{(U''_{S\times[0,1]}, \pi''_{S\times[0,1]}, \rho''_{S\times[0,1]}, \gamma''_{S\times[0,1]})\}$ and some $\delta''_{S\times[0,1]}$. Note that $V_S'' \cap M\times 1 = V_S \times 1$, $V_{TS}'' \cap M \times 1 = V_{TS} \times 1$, $V_S'' \cap M \times 0 = V_S' \times 0$, and $V_{TS}'' \cap M \times 0 = V_{TS}' \times 0$ for an appropriate choice of the δ_S and δ_S'. So by Lemma 14 $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ and $\{V_S', V_{TS}', p_{TS}'\}$ are isomorphic. □

7. Generic Morse cells satisfy the Whitney conditions

We could fancify the following to allow convex corners on the boundary of M and have f be locally constant on some components of each $\partial_k M$ and submerse other components, $k > 0$. I leave it to the reader to correctly state all that. The proof will be the same.

Recall that a gradientlike vector field for a Morse function f on M is a vector field v on M so that $v(f) \geq 0$ everywhere, $v(f) = 0$ only at critical points of f, and near each critical point there are local coordinates (x,y) so that in these coordinates $f(x,y) = c + |y|^2 - |x|^2$ and $v(x,y) = (-x,y)$.

Let ϕ_t be the flow on M obtained by integrating v. The stable manifold of a critical point p is $S_p = \{q \in M \mid \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi_t(q) = p\}$ and the unstable manifold of p is $U_p = \{q \in M \mid \lim_{t\to-\infty} \phi_t(q) = p\}$.

The reason for writing this paper was to prove the following result.

Lemma 19. *Let $f\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Morse function on a compact smooth manifold M possibly with boundary (but without corners on the boundary). Suppose f is locally constant on ∂M and has no critical points on ∂M. Suppose that v is a gradientlike*

vector field on M so that each of its stable manifolds is transverse to each of its unstable manifolds. Let $M' \subset M$ be the union of the stable manifolds. Then:

1. *The stratification of M' by stable manifolds is a Whitney stratification.*
2. *For each regular value c of f, the stratification of $M' \cap f^{-1}(c)$ by the intersections with stable manifolds is a Whitney stratification.*
3. *If p and q are critical points of f and S_p intersects ClS_q, then $S_p \subset ClS_q$ and $f(p) < f(q)$.*
4. *M' is a closed subset of M.*
5. *If ∂M is empty, there is a CW complex structure on M so that the stable manifolds are the (interiors of) the cells.*
6. *If all points of ∂M are local minima of f, there is a relative CW complex structure on $(M, \partial M)$ so that the stable manifolds are the (interiors of) the cells.*
7. *In general, $(M', M' \cap \partial M)$ has a relative CW complex structure so that the stable manifolds are the (interiors of) the cells.*

Proof. To see that M' is closed, let ϕ_t be the flow generated by v and take any $x \in M - M'$. If $\phi_t(x)$ is defined for all $t \geq 0$ then by compactness of M there must be a sequence $t_i \to \infty$ so that $\phi_{t_i}(x) \to$ some p. We must have $v(p) = 0$, hence p is a critical point and $x \in S_p \subset M'$, a contradiction. So there is a $t_0 > 0$ so that $\phi_{t_0}(x) \in \partial M$. But then by continuity of ϕ, for all y near x there is a t_y so that $\phi_{t_y}(y) \in \partial M$ and thus all y near x are not in M'.

Note the second item follows immediately from the first since if S, T satisfies the Whitney conditions and N is transverse to S and T, then $N \cap S, N \cap T$ satisfies the Whitney conditions.

The third item also follows from the first. $S_p \cap ClS_q$ is closed in S_p, but it is also open in S_p because of local triviality of Whitney stratifications. However, to keep things elementary we will provide another proof below.

Let p be a critical point of f. We assume by induction that S_r, S_q satisfies the Whitney conditions for all stable manifolds S_r and S_q with $f(r) > f(p)$. We also assume by induction that if S_r intersects ClS_q and $f(r) > f(p)$ then $S_r \subset ClS_q$ and $f(q) > f(r)$.

Suppose p has index k. Near p we have nice local coordinates, $h\colon (V_p, p) \to \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ with:

- $fh^{-1}(x, y) = f(p) + |y|^2 - |x|^2$.
- $dh(v)(x, y) = (-x, y)$.
- $h\phi_t h^{-1}(x, y) = (e^{-t}x, e^t y)$.
- The stable manifold of p near p is $S_p \cap V_p = h^{-1}(\{(x, 0) \in V_p\})$.
- The unstable manifold of p near p is $U_p \cap V_p = h^{-1}(\{(0, y) \in V_p\})$.

For convenience we may suppose $h(V_p)$ is the set of (x, y) with $|x| < 2\epsilon$ and $|y| < 2\epsilon$. Note we don't have much control over what another stable manifold S_q looks like in these coordinates, other than it being invariant under ϕ_t.

Assertion 19.1. *Suppose $q \neq p$ is another critical point and $U_p \cap S_q$ is nonempty. Then $S_p \subset ClS_q$ and $f(q) > f(p)$.*

Proof. Suppose $z \in U_p \cap S_q$. Since stable and unstable manifolds are invariant under ϕ_t, by taking t to be large and negative we get $h\phi_t(z) = (0, y_0) \in h(U_p \cap S_q)$. Since S_q is transverse to U_p we know that projection to the $\mathbb{R}^k$ coordinate submerses $h(S_q)$ near $h(U_p)$, so there is a smooth embedding $\kappa\colon U \to S_q$ where U is a neighborhood

of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^k$ and $h\kappa(x) = (x, \kappa'(x))$ for some κ' with $\kappa'(0) = y_0$. Pick any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ near 0. Then $h\phi_{-i}\kappa(e^{-i}x_0) = (x_0, e^{-i}\kappa'(e^{-i}x_0))$ $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ is a sequence of points in $h(S_q)$ which approaches $(x_0, 0)$ so $(x_0, 0) \in h(S_p \cap ClS_q)$. But any point in S_p is $\phi_t h^{-1}((x, 0))$ for some t and some $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ near 0, so $S_p \subset ClS_q$. Since $q \neq p$ we know $y_0 \neq 0$ so $f(q) \geq fh^{-1}(0, y_0) = f(p) + |y_0|^2 > f(p)$. □

Assertion 19.2. *Suppose $x_i \in S_q$ is a sequence and $x_i \to x_0 \in S_p$, $q \neq p$. Then after perhaps taking a subsequence there is a sequence $t_i \to \infty$ so that:*

1. *$h\phi_{t_i}(x_i) = (x_i', y_i')$ and $h\phi_{t_0}(x_i) = (x_i'', y_i'')$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots$.*
2. *$(x_i', y_i') \to (0, y_0)$ for some $y_0 \neq 0$.*
3. *$(0, y_0) \in h(S_r)$ for some critical point r with $f(r) > f(p)$.*
4. *If L_i is the tangent space to $h(S_q)$ at (x_i', y_i') then $L_i \to L$ with L transverse to $0 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$.*

Proof. Choose t_0 large enough that $\phi_{t_0}(x_0) \in V_p$ and let $h\phi_{t_0}(x_0) = (x_0', 0)$. After taking a subsequence we may suppose each $\phi_{t_0}(x_i) \in V_p$. Let $h\phi_{t_0}(x_i) = (x_i'', y_i'')$. Since $\phi_{t_0}(x_i) \to \phi_{t_0}(x_0)$ we know $x_i'' \to x_0'$ and $y_i'' \to 0$. Let $t_i = t_0 + \ln \epsilon - \ln |y_i''|$. Then $h\phi_{t_i}(x_i) = (|y_i''|x_i''/\epsilon, \epsilon y_i''/|y_i''|) = (x_i', y_i')$. After taking a subsequence we may assume $(x_i', y_i') \to (0, y_0)$ and $L_i \to L$ for some y_0 and L. Since M' is closed we know $(0, y_0) \in h(S_r)$ for some r. We have $f(r) \geq fh^{-1}(0, y_0) = f(p) + |y_0|^2 = f(p) + \epsilon^2 > f(p)$.

If $r = q$ then L is the tangent space to $h(S_q)$ at $(0, y_0)$. Since S_q is transverse to U_p we know that L is transverse to $0 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. If $r \neq q$ we know by our induction assumption that S_r, S_q satisfies the Whitney conditions so L contains the tangent space to $h(S_r)$ at $(0, y_0)$ which by assumption is transverse to $h(U_p)$. Hence L is transverse to $0 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. □

Pick any critical point $q \neq p$ so that $S_p \cap ClS_q$ is nonempty. We need to show that $S_p \subset ClS_q$. By Assertion 19.1 we reduce to the case where $U_p \cap S_q$ is empty. In fact this cannot happen, but let's pretend it does. By Assertion 19.2 there is a critical point r so that $U_p \cap S_r$ is nonempty and $S_r \cap ClS_q$ is nonempty and $f(r) > f(p)$. By our induction assumption we know $S_r \subset ClS_q$ and $f(q) > f(r)$. By Assertion 19.1, we know $S_p \subset ClS_r$. Hence $S_p \subset ClS_r \subset ClClS_q = ClS_q$ and $f(q) > f(r) > f(p)$. So we have proven the third item.

Now let us turn our attention to proving that S_p, S_q satisfies Whitney conditions at a point $x_0 \in S_p$. Take sequences $x_i \in S_q$ and $z_i \in S_p$ so that $x_i \to x_0$, $z_i \to x_0$, the tangent spaces to S_q at x_i converge to some L_0 and the secant lines $|z_i x_i|$ converge to some ℓ. We need to show that $\ell \subset L_0$. Pick t_i, L_i, L, etc. satisfying the conclusions of Assertion 19.2 and let $(z_i', 0) = h\phi_{t_0}(z_i)$. Now

$$dhd\phi_{t_0}\ell = \lim(x_i'' - z_i', y_i'')/\sqrt{|x_i'' - z_i'|^2 + |y_i''|^2} = (w, ay_0)$$

for some $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since L is transverse to $0 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, L contains a subspace of the form $\{(x, Ax)\}$ for some linear transformation $A\colon \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. Since $L_i \to L$, for large enough i we know L_i contains a subspace of the form $\{(x, A_i x)\}$ for some linear transformation $A_i\colon \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, and $A_i \to A$. (For example, A could be obtained from L by some algorithmic Gaussian elimination process and the same algorithm applied to L_i would produce A_i converging to A.)

Note that in block form, the derivative $dh\phi_t h^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-t}I & 0 \\ 0 & e^{t}I \end{bmatrix}$. Let $L_i' = dh\phi_{t_0-t_i}h^{-1}L_i$ denote the tangent space to $h(S_q)$ at (x_i'', y_i''). Note $e^{t_0-t_i}(w, A_i w) \in L_i$ so applying $dh\phi_{t_0-t_i}h^{-1}$ we get $(w, e^{2t_0-2t_i}A_i w) \in L_i'$. But $e^{t_0-t_i} = |y_i''|/\epsilon \to 0$ so $(w, e^{2t_0-2t_i}A_i w) \to (w, 0)$ and thus $(w, 0) \in dh\phi_{t_0}h^{-1}L_0$. Note L_i must contain the tangent to the flow curve at (x_i', y_i') which is $(-x_i', y_i')$. Thus L_i must contain $(-x_i', y_i') + (x_i', A_i x_i') = (0, y_i' + A_i x_i')$. So $dh\phi_{t_0-t_i}h^{-1}(0, e^{t_i-t_0}(y_i' + A_i x_i')) = (0, y_i' + A_i x_i') \in L_i'$. But $(0, y_i' + A_i x_i') \to (0, y_0)$ and thus $(0, y_0) \in dh\phi_{t_0}h^{-1}L_0$. So $dh\phi_{t_0}h^{-1}\ell = (w, ay_0) \in dh\phi_{t_0}h^{-1}L_0$ and thus $\ell \in L_0$.

To finish it suffices to prove conclusion 7, since 5 and 6 are special cases of 7. By Lemma 13 it suffices to prove that if we take an untico resolution tower $\{V_S, V_{TS}, p_{TS}\}$ of M' then all the V_S are homeomorphic to discs of various dimensions. I will give two proofs, the first using results unknown at the time I first noticed this result and the second more elementary. For the first method, note that the interior of V_S is diffeomorphic to S which is diffeomorphic to some $\mathbb{R}^k$. Then the following assertion shows each V_S is a disc.

Assertion 19.3. *Let D be a compact topological manifold whose interior is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^k$. Then D is homeomorphic to the k dimensional disc.*

Proof. I won't bother explaining terms used here since the reader either knows this already or can look up this result elsewhere. The end of the interior of D is collared by $\partial D \times [0, 1)$ and by $S^{k-1} \times [0, 1)$. Any two collarings of an end of a manifold differ by an invertible cobordism, so ∂D is invertibly cobordant to S^{k-1}, and hence is a homotopy sphere. By the Poincaré conjecture, now a theorem in all dimensions in Top, we know ∂D is then homeomorphic to S^{k-1}. By the Top Schoenflies theorem, D is homeomorphic to the k disc. □

The second proof follows from the following assertion by following flow curves.

Assertion 19.4. *There are enhanced Thom data $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ for M' and frontier limit functions δ_S so that the flow curves ϕ_t of v are transverse to each V_{TS} and point into V_S.*

Proof. Take any stratum S, the stable manifold S_p of some critical point p of index k. As above we take nice coordinates $h\colon (V_p, p) \to \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ around p. After shrinking V_p we may as well suppose there are $\epsilon_S > 0$ and $\epsilon_S' > 0$ so that $h(V_p) = \{(x, y) \mid \epsilon_S' > |x||y|, -\epsilon_S < |y|^2 - |x|^2 < \epsilon_S\}$. Let V_p' be the set of $z \in M$ so that for some $t \geq 0$, $\phi_t(z) \in V_p$. Note that $V_p \subset V_p'$ and V_p' is a neighborhood of S in M. We may extend h to V_p' by setting $h(z) = (ux, y/u)$ where we choose $t \geq 0$ so $(x, y) = h\phi_t(z)$ and u is the unique positive number so that $f(z) = f(p) + |y|^2/u^2 - |x|^2u^2$. This is independent of our choice of t. This extension h has many of the nice properties of the original, $fh^{-1}(x, y) = f(p) + |y|^2 - |x|^2$, $S = V_p' \cap S = h^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^k \times 0)$, and $h\phi_t h^{-1}(x, y) = (u(t)x,\ y/u(t))$ for some smooth positive function u (depending on x, y, and S). Note that $u'(t) < 0$ since $0 < df\phi_t h^{-1}(x, y)/dt = -2u'(t)(|y|^2/u^3(t) + u(t)|x|^2)$. By Lemmas 16 and 9 we may find enhanced Thom data $\{(U_S, \pi_S, \rho_S, \gamma_S)\}$ for M' so that $U_S \subset V_p'$ and $\rho_S h^{-1}(x, y) = |y|^2$. Note that the flow curves of v are transverse to the level sets $\rho_S^{-1}(\delta)$ and flow in the direction of increasing ρ_S. So we need only choose our frontier limit functions δ_S so that they are a constant on the compact set $V_S = S - \bigcup_{T \prec S}\{x \in S \cap U_T \mid \rho_T(x) < \delta_T \pi_T(x)\}$. □

□

8. Uniqueness of Special Coordinates

For no other reason than mathematical amusement, we now turn to the question of how unique special coordinates are: given two special local coordinates around a critical point, what can you say about the local diffeomorphism h which changes one to the other. The equations are:

$$v \circ h = dh \circ v \tag{1}$$

$$f \circ h = f \tag{2}$$

Plugging 0 into equation (1) we have $v(h(0)) = dh(0) = 0$ so $h(0) = 0$. If A is the linear part of the Taylor series of h, then the quadratic part of equation (2) is $fA = f$ from which we deduce that $A = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$ where B and C are orthogonal. Since this linear part itself preserves special local coordinates and the special coordinate preserving (local) diffeomorphisms form a group, we may as well suppose that the linear part A is the identity.

From equation (1), we know that h preserves the flow of v, so $\phi_t h = h\phi_t$ which means

$$e^t h_i(x,y) = h_i(e^t x, e^{-t} y) \text{ if } i \leq k \tag{3}$$

$$e^{-t} h_i(x,y) = h_i(e^t x, e^{-t} y) \text{ if } i > k \tag{4}$$

for t near 0, or more precisely, as long as ϕ_t remains within our coordinate patch. Combining this with equation (2) we see[2] that in fact equation (2) splits up as two equations:

$$|x|^2 = \Sigma_{i=1}^{k} h_i(x,y)^2 \tag{5}$$

$$|y|^2 = \Sigma_{i=k+1}^{n} h_i(x,y)^2. \tag{6}$$

Note that if $y = 0$ then equation (3) is valid for all $t \leq 0$ so $h(sx, 0) = sh(x, 0)$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. From this we conclude[3] $h(x, 0) = x$. Likewise, $h(0, y) = y$.

Consequently, if $k = 0$ or $k = n$ or $n = 2$ then h is the identity, so any special local coordinate preserving diffeomorphism is linear, in fact orthogonal. But in all other cases there are nonlinear examples as we will show.

Pick ϵ small enough that our coordinate charts contain the 2ϵ ball. We have a parameterized family $f_{y,s}$ of diffeomorphisms of the unit $k-1$ sphere and a parameterized family $g_{x,s}$ of diffeomorphisms of the unit $n-k-1$ sphere, for y in the unit $n-k-1$ sphere and x in the unit $k-1$ sphere and $s \in (0, \epsilon]$ defined by:

$$h(\epsilon x, sy) = (\epsilon f_{y,s}(x), s g_{x,s}(y)).$$

Note that as $s \to 0$ then $h(\epsilon x, sy) \to \epsilon x$ so $f_{y,s} \to$ the identity. Also, by equations (3) and (4) with $t = \ln s/\epsilon$ we have

$$h(sx, \epsilon y) = (s f_{y,s}(x), \epsilon g_{x,s}(y))$$

---

[2] Multiply (2) by e^{2t}, take d/dt and Bob's your uncle.

[3] Write $h(x,0) = x + \Sigma_{i=1}^{k} \Sigma_{j=1}^{i} x_i x_j g_{ij}(x)$ for some smooth g_{ij}, then we get $s\Sigma_{i=1}^{k} \Sigma_{j=1}^{i} x_i x_j g_{ij}(sx) = \Sigma_{i=1}^{k} \Sigma_{j=1}^{i} x_i x_j g_{ij}(x)$. Letting $s \to 0$ we conclude the right hand side is 0.

so as $s \to 0$ we have $g_{x,s} \to$ the identity. For general x, y we likewise get

$$h(x,y) = (|x| f_{y/|y|,s}(x/|x|), |y| g_{x/|x|,s}(y/|y|))$$

where $s = |y||x|/\epsilon$.

To get a nontrivial example if $n > k > 1$ the trick is to pick f and g so that the resulting h is smooth. For example, we could pick a nontrivial smooth curve $\tau\colon (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \to O(k)$ with $\tau(0)$ the identity and let $g_{x,s}$ be the identity and let $f_{y,s} = \tau(e^{-1/s})$. A tedious[4] calculation shows that the resulting h is C^∞ smooth and satisfies equations (1) and (2).

References

[1] S. Akbulut and H. King, *Topology of Real Algebraic Sets*, MSRI Publications 25, Springer Verlag (1992).

[2] J-M. Bismut and W. Zhang, *An extension of a theorem by Cheeger and Müller*, Astrisque No. 205 (1992).

[3] D. Burghelea, L. Friedlander, and T. Kappeler, *On the space of trajectories of a generic gradient-like vector field*, arXiv:1101.0788v2 [math.DS]

[4] C. G. Gibson, K. Wirthmüller, A. A. du Plessis, E. J. N. Looijenga, *Topological Stability of Smooth Mappings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 552, Springer-Verlag (1976).

[5] D. Joyce, *On manifolds with corners*, arXiv:0910.3518v2 [math.DG]

[6] H. King, *Tico Spines* arXiv:1602.02608 [math.GT]

[7] H. King and D. Trotman, *Poincare-Hopf Theorems on Singular Spaces*, Proceedings of the London Math. Soc., (2014) 108 (3), pp. 682-703.

[8] J. Mather, *Notes on Topological Stability*, currently available at http://web.math.princeton.edu/facultypapers/mather/notes_on_topological_stability.pdf

[9] L. Nicolaescu, *Tame Flows*, AMS Memoirs 980.

[10] L. Qin, *On moduli spaces and CW structures arising from Morse theory on Hilbert manifolds*, J. Topol. Anal. 2 (2010), no. 4, 469526.

[11] L. Qin, *An application of topological equivalence to Morse Theory*, arXiv:1102.2838 [math.GT]

[12] R. Thom, *Ensembles et morphismes stratifiés*, Bull. A. M. S., 75 (1969), pp. 240-284.

Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4015
E-mail address: hck@math.umd.edu
URL: http://www.math.umd.edu/~hck/

[4] We have $h(x,y) = (\tau(e^{-1/s})(x), y)$ so for $i \le k$ we have $\Sigma_{j=1}^k x_j \partial h_i/\partial x_j - \Sigma_{j=1}^{n-k} y_j \partial h_i/\partial y_j = \tau_i(e^{-1/s})(x) + \tau_i'(e^{-1/s})(x) e^{-1/s} s^{-2}(\Sigma_{j=1}^k x_j^2 s/|x|^2 - \Sigma_{j=1}^{n-k} y_j^2 s/|y|^2) = \tau_i(e^{-1/s})(x) = h_i(x,y)$. This shows the tedious part of equation (1).